UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,052	10/09/2003	Kuo Reay Peng	TS01-037B [N1085-90136]	8179

8933 7590 09/27/2006

DUANE MORRIS, LLP
IP DEPARTMENT
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196

EXAMINER	
JACKSON JR, JEROME	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2815	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/682,052	PENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jerome Jackson Jr.	2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *29-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *29-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 29,30,32-40,42-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ohnakado '504, of record.

Ohnakado shows in figure 10 a series of diodes connected between first, Vdd, and second, ground, power supply voltage sources, and an internal integrated circuit 100 located between the first and second power supply voltages. The new limitations in the claims therefor do not structurally distinguish the claims over Ohnakado.

Claims 29-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnakado in view of Jang, of record.

The previous rejection still applies.

Claims 29,30,32-40,42-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chang '052, of record.

The previous rejection still applies. Figure 21 shows a string of diodes between Vss and Vdd power supply sources and an internal integrated circuit located between the power supply sources as is necessary for both applicant's and Chang's device to properly function.

Claims 29-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnakado with Jang and further in view of Doyle, of record.

The previous rejection still applies.

Applicant's arguments filed 7/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Contrary to applicant's arguments on page 7 of the remarks, Ohnakado

clearly does show a string of diodes connected between power supply sources. The string is also connected to the I/O pad 30a, as applicant states, nonetheless, the diodes are also connected head to tail between Vdd and ground, and also connected to an internal integrated circuit. The circuitry and structure claimed is anticipated by the applied art. The circuit connections claimed are fundamental and shown by the applied art. In these ESD protection arrangements the protection devices have to be connected to both power supplies and to the internal circuitry or else the internal circuitry will not be protected. It is fundamental in this art. Applicant's circuit arguments are unconvincing of patentability.

Arguments regarding the "power distribution networks" are also unconvincing because such language does not structurally distinguish over the necessary "power distribution networks" comprising the necessary wiring going to the internal integrated circuits of the applied art. There is no novel structure either described or claimed regarding applicant's "power distribution network". If applicant argues that such "power distribution network" is novel structure, a question of enablement or definiteness will arise because there is no description of any definite "power distribution network" that is novel or could possibly distinguish over what would be considered routine in the admitted or applied prior art. See applicant's description of the prior art "power supply distribution networks" on pages 1-9 of the specification.

Arguments regarding Ohnakado with Jang are also unconvincing of patentability because the arguments against Ohnakado are not convincing as shown above.

Arguments regarding Chang are also unconvincing because Chang clearly does show a string of polysilicon diodes serially connected as claimed. See again figures 21 or 22 and the polysilicon diode structure shown in other figures. Note that pn junction diodes are connected in series between power supplies Vdd and Vss.

Arguments regarding Ohnakado with Jang and Doyle are also unconvincing because the arguments against Ohnakado are unconvincing as shown above.

Arguments regarding dependent claims 38 and 48 are unconvincing of patentability because the claim recitations do not specifically recite any specific magnitudes or values for threshold voltages, noise voltages, supply voltages, or number of diodes which would unequivocally distinguish over the applied art values or magnitudes. At best the recited language can be equated to "predetermined" magnitudes which would in no way structurally distinguish over the inherent values of the applied art. In other words, applicant has not shown that the applied art does not also inherently possess the claimed "n" number of diodes, "noise voltage", "threshold voltage", etc.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Jackson Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-1730. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jj

JEROME JACKSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER